

Fact Sheet

HOW THE SYSTEM WORKS NOW

SAN FRANCISCO JUVENILE PROBATION SYSTEM

• PROCESS OF REFERRALS TO JUVENILE HALL

Approximately 7,000 juvenile law violators are referred each year through a variety of methods, the most common of which is bookings. In this circumstance, a youth is brought directly to the Youth Guidance Center (YGC) for processing by any of a number of referral agencies -- police, parents, schools, and others. The second referral method is citations, in which a youth is cited by law enforcement at a location other than YGC and required to meet with Probation Department staff at a future date to determine appropriate court action and/or the extent of informal supervision.

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAY 26 1987

• BOOKING

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Presently, for those youths who are booked at YGC, placement options for Intake Probation Officers or Counselors are quite limited. Youths are either held temporarily until the parents or guardians can be contacted or they are admitted to Juvenile Hall.

• INVESTIGATION

Once youths are admitted to Juvenile Hall, they are within the court's jurisdiction and supervision. They are subject to investigation by the Intake Department.

ДЕРЕВНЯНКА
УСКОДІ ТЮСТІ
СІЛАНІ КІМ
СІЛАНІ ТІМІЛІ

- FILING OF CHARGES

The Intake Unit conducts an investigation and makes the initial placement decision based upon the risk which the youth presents to himself, the public, or the court process. The Intake Probation Officer then makes a determination that a petition should be filed with the court, and prepares a Social History Report (also referred to as the Probation Officer's Investigation and Dispositional Report).

- FINAL DISPOSITION BY THE COURT

The youth is then brought before a Family Court judge who makes the decision regarding final disposition.

and the 1970s open data system. In general, there were
no major changes until the mid-1980s when the first software specifically
designed with a learning curve was released, and in 1990 and 2000 it
was finding a broad and favorable audience, particularly among
young people who wanted to learn how to code and program.
In fact, the first bright young minds to

successfully learn how to code and program were the ones who
were born in the 1990s and 2000s, and those people have become the
newest generation of programmers.

4



Fact Sheet

STUDY OF THE SAN FRANCISCO JUVENILE PROBATION SYSTEM

WHO COMMISSIONED THE STUDY

The study was commissioned by the San Francisco Juvenile Court (Judge Daniel Weinstein, Presiding); and the Juvenile Probation Department (Dennis Sweeney, Chief Probation Officer).

HOW MUCH DID THE STUDY COST

\$365,000

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

MAY 26 1987

HOW LONG DID THE STUDY TAKE

Seven (7) months

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

HOW WAS THE STUDY DONE

The planning team conducted a comprehensive review of the youth and operations of the Youth Guidance Center.

1) The planning study was premised on five precepts:

- a. That the Juvenile Court and Probation Department are not isolated units working with particular types of children, but are part of a network of agencies that include education, social services, health, and mental health.
- b. That current conditions of confinement at the Youth Guidance Center must be improved. The present design

2

of the facility is inadequate.

- c. That youths should be handled at the family or neighborhood level whenever possible; however, a level of secure juvenile detention is necessary to protect the public and to stop youths from harming themselves.
 - d. That each youth be detained in the least restrictive environment possible consistent with public safety, integrity of the court process, and the best interest of the youth.
 - e. That architectural designs of structural facilities reflect and accommodate the programs and policies developed in the planning phase.
- 2) A profile of the youth population including present and future youth offenders was developed. Two techniques were used to establish this profile.
- a. A survey of over 1,100 referral of youth to Juvenile Hall over a 45-day period.
 - b. 350 case files were examined from court dispositions in a random survey.
- 3) A national literature review was conducted to establish standards as a basis for evaluating services currently provided by the department. Notable among the standards

3

are those recommended by the American Bar Association, American Correctional Association, and the California Correctional Association.

- 4) An employee attitude survey was conducted and completed by over 200 employees of the department ranging from judges to maintenance workers.
- 5) Planning team members accompanied police officers on patrol in high youth crime areas.
- 6) Over 120 personal interviews with key decision-makers were conducted within the department and related public and private youth service agencies, line operation staff in each functional area of the department, citizen advocates, appointed and elected officials, youths in residence at the YGC, and parents familiar with the department.
- 7) A comprehensive analysis of all current physical conditions existing at the San Francisco Youth Guidance Center was made. Experienced licensed architects, planners, and structural, electrical and mechanical engineers reviewed all available drawings, specifications and reports regarding the current physical conditions of the Youth Guidance Center facility. They toured the buildings and grounds on many occasions and discussed specific critical aspects of the systems comprising the YGC with present and past engineers responsible for maintaining these systems.

Team members reviewed anticipated future work with the San Francisco Bureau of Architecture and coordinated study findings to produce a comprehensive assessment.

Throughout the investigations, all data were inventoried prior to analysis so that study findings could be used for any future remodeling schemes. Also, appropriate state and national standards were reviewed as a basis for facility evaluation.

- 8) With this information on hand, conceptual options and recommendations for action were developed and presented to the Department of Juvenile Probation at a series of discussion meetings for departmental staff, key decision makers, community leaders, and citizen advocates.
- 9) Based on these discussions, a model program and facility assessment were prepared for public review prior to implementation.



CITY and County of San Francisco
Juvenile Court



SFCA 0191
S Doc. 157

SUPERIOR COURT

DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN

SUPERVISING JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

Fact Sheet

JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICE
DENNIS SWEENEY
CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

STUDY PLANNING TEAM

SAN FRANCISCO JUVENILE PROBATION SYSTEM

JEFFERSON ASSOCIATES, INC.

(415) 931-3001

- San Francisco-based urban planning and design firm
- Sixteen (16) years old
- Other Project Experience
 - 1) Master planning, design and construction supervision of the \$21 million Southeast Community Multi-Service Center in Bayview/Hunters Point
 - 2) Formulation of a Master Plan for the Commercial Revitalization of Downtown Oakland
 - 3) Planning consultants to Santa Fe/Southern Pacific on the Mission Bay Project
 - 4) Design of replacement structures for Piers 30 and 32 for the Port of San Francisco

• Key Personnel

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBRARY

1) James D. Jefferson, Managing Principal

MAY 26 1987

2) James Stroupe, Project Manager

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

3) Stan Gentle, Community Liaison

COMMUNITY RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

(217) 398-3120

- Based in Champaign, Illinois
- Nationally-renowned specialists in juvenile services planning, detention facilities operations, programming and design
- Other Project Experience
 - 1) Facility design and operations analysis for the New York City Department of Juvenile Justice
 - 2) Development of three Model Correctional Facilities for the Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice



3) Comprehensive Study on Youth Correctional Institutions
for the Idaho Commission on Children and Youth

• Key Personnel

- 1) James Brown, Project Director
- 2) Joseph Thome, Project Coordinator

SPECIAL CONSULTANTS

Joseph R. Rowan, Executive Director
Juvenile and Criminal Justice International, Inc.
Roseville, Minnesota

Jeffery Mitchell, M.D.
Department of Child Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine
Children's Orthopedic Hospital and Medical Center
Seattle, Washington

Charles J. Kehoe
Berrien County Juvenile Court
St. Joseph, Michigan

Robert B. Rutherford, Jr., Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

SPECIAL ADVISOR

Henry Izumizaki
San Francisco Foundation



City and County of San Francisco
Juvenile Court



SFCA-0191
15 Doc. 7 of 7

SUPERIOR COURT
DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN
SUPERVISING JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

Fact Sheet

JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICE
DENNIS SWEENEY
CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

STATISTICS/DEMOGRAPHICS

- San Francisco has a total mid-1980s population of approximately 700,000 persons.
- San Francisco has a juvenile population of approximately 51,000 youth. This number is projected to decrease slightly over the next several years before increasing again through the turn of the century.
- Approximately 7,000 juvenile law violators are referred to the San Francisco Probation Department each year.
- Four San Francisco neighborhoods (Western Addition, Inner Mission, Outer Mission, Bayview/Hunters Point) account for 57 percent of juvenile law violators. **INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBRARY**
- Minorities represent nearly 42 percent of San Francisco population and account for nearly 65 percent of all Juvenile Court referrals. **MAY 26 1987 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**
- Blacks comprise 13 percent of the City's population and account for 42 percent of referrals of law violators.
- Whites represent a substantial majority of youths referred to the court for 601 violations.
- It costs an average of \$70 per bed per day to maintain a youth in locked detention.



City and County of San Francisco
Juvenile Court



SFCA-0191

5

4 of 7

SUPERIOR COURT

DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN

SUPERVISING JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICE

DENNIS SWEENEY

CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

FACT SHEET

HIGHLIGHTS OF STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

STUDY OF THE SAN FRANCISCO JUVENILE PROBATION DEPARTMENT

1. Number of Non-Violent Youth in Locked Detention Could Be Drastically Reduced

Through the development of community-based service programs and staff-secure detention facilities within the neighborhoods, the number of non-violent youth placed in locked detention at the Youth Guidance Center (YGC) can be reduced from the present daily average of 122 to a range of 38 to 60 youth.

The combination of proposed objective detention criteria with alternative, closely supervised community housing and detention facilities, will result in a substantial decline in the number of youth who require locked detention within the current facility. For example, the types of youth who should be housed in neighborhoods would be:

MAY 26 1987

- A. Non-violent youth awaiting out-of-home placement
- B. Non-violent youth detained because they lack a family or safe place to live pending adjudication of their case;
- C. Non-violent youth committed by the court for 30-90 days essentially for the purpose of assessment.

2. The Juvenile Probation Department Should Establish Youth Service Centers within High Risk Neighborhoods.

The youth service centers would promote early intervention and accountability by diverting non-violent youth to effective community-based service programs for the treatment and resolution of problems confronting the youth, their families, and the neighborhoods. Referrals would be taken directly from police, parents, teachers, and youth on a 24-hour-a-day basis.



The youth who would be referred to the youth service centers currently make up 68 percent of all referrals to the Juvenile Court. These youth are ones who have been alleged to have engaged in conduct that would not constitute a serious felony or a violent crime. The remaining approximately 30 percent of youth who are accused of serious felonies or violent activities would be referred to YGC, where long-term locked detention would be available.

3. A Majority of Probation Officers Should Be Relocated into Neighborhoods of San Francisco

A majority of the probation officers, including the Director of Probation Services, would be assigned to youth service centers in the neighborhoods. Probation officers would be asked to resume the traditional role of a juvenile probation officer and free themselves from their office environment. The thrust of the reports suggests that the probation officer needs to get back on the streets, in the neighborhoods and schools, and on the playgrounds.

4. Availability of Services and Quality of Care Could Be Improved with the Hiring of an Independent Program Developer

The development of new, innovative and economically sound treatment programs can be accomplished through the establishment of an Independent Program Developer (IPD). An IPD would give the Juvenile Probation Department the flexibility to respond quickly to the ever-changing needs of the client population by providing the flexibility to draw from the diverse resources of the numerous non-profit, private agencies in attempting to address these needs.



While diverse in their nature, these programs will all emphasize certain common themes:

- character building -- the ability to say "no"
- restitution to public for losses
- strict accountability for personal actions through rewards and sanctions
- realization of educational and vocational potential through individualized programs
- renewed effort to foster family and neighborhood involvement

5. A Comprehensive Assessment, Diagnostic and Evaluation Center Should be Established

The Woodside Learning Center currently operated by the San Francisco Unified School District, should be established as a comprehensive assessment, diagnostic and evaluation center for those students in the program for three to five days or less. The purpose of the assessment would be to determine youths' academic, social skills, daily living and prevocational and vocational strengths and weaknesses.

6. Optional Architectural Models to Accommodate the Proposed Programmatic Changes Are Forthcoming

The draft report does not presently contain any proposed new physical facilities. The major programmatic changes suggested in the report must be subjected to thorough public debate and approved by the Juvenile Justice Commission and ultimately the Superior Court before they are adopted.

and the number of species per sample were used to calculate the mean species richness and the mean species density for each site. The mean species richness was calculated by dividing the total number of species found at all sites by the number of sites. The mean species density was calculated by dividing the total number of individuals found at all sites by the total area of all sites.

The following methods were used to analyze the data: descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multivariate analysis.

Descriptive statistics: Descriptive statistics were used to describe the data.

Correlation analysis: Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between variables.

Multivariate analysis: Multivariate analysis was used to determine the relationship between variables and the environment. The following methods were used: principal component analysis, discriminant function analysis, and cluster analysis.

Principal component analysis: Principal component analysis was used to reduce the dimensionality of the data.

Discriminant function analysis: Discriminant function analysis was used to determine the relationship between variables and the environment.

Cluster analysis: Cluster analysis was used to group the data into clusters.

The following methods were used to analyze the data: descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multivariate analysis.

Descriptive statistics: Descriptive statistics were used to describe the data.

Correlation analysis: Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between variables.

Multivariate analysis: Multivariate analysis was used to determine the relationship between variables and the environment.

The importance of the optional architectural models is best underscored by quoting Winston Churchill: "We shape our buildings and then they shape us." To avoid this dilemma and to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past, any new or remodeled building must be designed around the new goals and operation of this agency, and the end product should be a facility that supports its operation and management. It is the interrelationship of building and function that makes the process an opportunity for YGC to evaluate its operation and needs and to modernize and improve its procedures.

7. The Present Facility is in Need of Major Health and Safety Improvements

For the past two decades, numerous experts and reports have universally criticized the present YGC. It comes as no surprise that the report documents health and safety changes in excess of \$2 million, which must be made just to bring it to acceptable limits while new facilities are being considered.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124889185